

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-25 and 27-29 were examined by the Office, and in the final Office Action of November 19, 2010 all claims are rejected. With this response, claims 1 and 3-10 are cancelled without prejudice and new claim 30 is added. All new claims are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Support for new claim can be found at least from page 26, line 33—page 28, line 2. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

This response is submitted along with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

As stated in the Interview Summary filed February 3, 2011 the claim language in the Office Action does not match the claim language from the currently pending claims. While the Office has stated that a new Office Action will be issued, applicant is filing this response without the benefit of a corrected Office Action in order to further advance prosecution of this application.

Claim Rejections Under § 102

In section 4, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-10, 12-16, 20-25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Yasuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,275). Applicant respectfully submits that Yasuda fails to disclose or suggest claim 12, because Yasuda fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 12. Yasuda at least fails to disclose or suggest forming at least a first transmission unit, forming at least a second transmission unit, defining a first identifier for the first transmission unit and a second identifier for the second transmission unit, and the first and the second identifiers being different from the video coding units, as recited in claim 12. For at least these reasons, claim 12 is not disclosed or suggested by Yasuda.

In Yasuda, the goal is to be able to provide smooth reverse playback of video by decoding video frames at regular intervals from the video stream. The main problem in Yasuda is to determine the frames to be decoded, since the number of frames in the different groups of pictures (GOPs) are not known. The solution is to decode a video stream to determine the number of pictures in a GOP, and then select the pictures to be decoded and displayed in reverse

order. In contrast to claim 12, Yasuda only deals with encoded video and does not disclose any transmission units. GOPs in Yasuda are groups of pictures formed by the video encoder, and before they could be transmitted, appropriate encapsulation and/or packetization is needed depending on the type of transmission in question. While Yasuda does mention that the smallest unit in which the video is transferred is a GOP, Yasuda also states that it could be a plurality of GOPs. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion of a transmission unit configured for network transmission in Yasuda. Instead, in Yasuda the GOP is a video coding unit, and not a transmission unit. Therefore, Yasuda does not disclose or suggest any identifiers of transmission units, since Yasuda does not disclose or suggest any transmission units. Since Yasuda is only concerned with video coding units, Yasuda is completely silent on composition or contents of any transmission units. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, claim 12 is not disclosed or suggested by Yasuda.

Independent claims 16, 20-25 and 27-28 contain limitations similar to claim 12, and therefore for at least for the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 12, these independent claims are not disclosed or suggested by Yasuda.

The claims depending from the independent claims listed above are also not disclosed or suggested by Yasuda at least in view of their dependencies. Furthermore, with respect to dependent claims 13 and 14, Yasuda is not concerned about the decoding order to pictures, and therefore does not disclose or suggest an identifier being indicative of decoding order. Instead, Yasuda only refers to a frame number, which is a number indicating the display order and not the decoding order. In addition, with respect to dependent claim 15, Yasuda also fails to disclose or suggest slices included in transmission units.

The rejection of claims 1 and 3-10 is moot in view of the cancellation of those claims.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 7, on page 8 of the Office Action, claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yasuda in view of Bigham et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,677,905). Claims 17 and 19 ultimately depend from independent claim 16, and Bigham fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Yasuda identified above. Therefore, claims 17

and 19 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 8, on page 9 of the Office Action, claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yasuda in view of Watkins (U.S. Publ. Appl. No. 2004/0039796). Claim 18 ultimately depends from independent claim 16, and Watkins fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Yasuda identified above. Therefore, claim 18 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of its dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 22 February 2011

/s/Keith R. Obert/

Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676